

### REMARKS

Claims 1-51 are pending, with claims 1, 23, and 37 being independent. Claims 50 and 51 are added herein. Support for the newly added claims are found throughout the application, including at least pages 18 to 23, and FIG.4 to FIG. 7. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and allowance of Applicant's claims are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 37 - 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Independent claim 37 is amended to overcome this rejection.

Claims 1-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,430,604 (Ogle). Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections because Ogle does not describe or suggest all the features of independent claims 1, 23, and 37, as amended.

Referring to particular claim language, independent claim 1 recites a notification system that reconfigures an electronic message to effect an enhanced notification. The system includes an input interface configured to receive at least one electronic message from a message source for delivery to an intended recipient. The system also includes a definition store configured to store one or more notification definitions that include trigger parameters based on attributes of electronic messages, including at least one of the message source and the message content. The system also includes a matching engine configured to determine whether the electronic message is to be delivered with an enhanced notification by comparing the trigger parameters in one or more notification definitions in the definition store with corresponding attributes of the electronic message, including at least one of the message source and the message content. The system also includes a user information store configured to store information related to the intended recipient. The system also includes an enhancement engine configured to reconfigure the electronic message to the enhanced notification if the information of the user information store indicates that the intended recipient is subscribed to receive the enhanced notification.

Ogle does not describe or suggest the features of determining whether the electronic message is to be delivered with an enhanced notification by comparing the trigger parameters that include at least one of the message source and the message content, as described in independent claim 1. Likewise, Ogle does not describe or suggest "determining whether to

reconfigure the electronic message as a second type message by comparing the accessed criteria with corresponding attributes of the electronic message including at least one of the message source and the message content characteristics detected,” as recited in independent claim 23. Ogle does not describe or suggest “a matching code segment that causes the computer to determine whether the electronic message is to be delivered with an enhanced notification by comparing the trigger parameters in one or more notification definitions corresponding attributes of the electronic message including at least one of the message source and the message content” as recited in independent claim 37. Simply, Ogle does not describe or suggest a determination of sending a notification message based on at least the message source or the message content.

Rather, Ogle describes a system that enables messages reaching the receiver via alternative message delivery mechanisms, “... users may register one or more alternative message delivery mechanisms (such as pagers, cell phones , etc.) through which they are available as an alternative to an instant messaging system.” *See, e.g., Abstract*. Ogle checks whether the receiver is “logged on” before delivering the message. If the receiver is not “logged on”, Ogle delivers the message via alternative delivery mechanisms based on entries as stored in the receiver’s registry. *See, e.g., FIG. 5A-5G*. Thus, Ogle determines how to send an electronic message based on receiver’s online status and stored information about alternative delivery systems.

Ogle, however, does not describe or suggest determining sending a notification message based on at least the message source or the message content. Ogle’s focus is on the recipient, not on the message itself. In fact, Ogle fails to look into either of the source or the content of the electronic message. Ogle instead directed its attention solely on the recipient, either on the recipient’s online status or on the recipient’s registry entries. Accordingly, Ogle fails to describe or suggest the feature of determining whether the electronic message is to be delivered with an enhanced notification by comparing the trigger parameters that includes at least one of the message source and the message content, as described in independent claim 1, and similarly in independent claims 23 and 37.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 23, 37 and those claims that depend from them, are allowable over Ogle for at least the reasons given above.

#### Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, objection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action's characterizations of the art, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the rejected claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

The Petition for Extension of Time fee of \$120 and excess claim fees of \$100 is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account 06 1050.

Applicant : Barry Appelman, et al  
Serial No. : 10/715,206  
Filed : November 18, 2003  
Page : 19 of 19

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-374001

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/20/2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
W. Karl Renner  
Reg. No. 41,265

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331